

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/903,132	0.	7/11/2001	Craig S. Skinner	035451-0139 (3664.Palm)	9538	
26371	7590	01/05/2004		EXAMINER		
FOLEY &			ELAHEE, MD S			
SUITE 3800		N AVENUE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
MILWAUK	EE, WI 5	3202-5308		2645		
				DATE MAILED: 01/05/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/903,132	SKINNER ET AL.	7
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Md S Elahee	2645	
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply	ion appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address	; <del></del>
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA*  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica*  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, It  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION.  CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may atton.  ys, a reply within the statutory minimum of y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) Moy statute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this communi ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ication.
Status  1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n		
·	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice u	allowance except for formal m		its is
Disposition of Claims		·	
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the appli	ication.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Ex			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)			
Applicant may not request that any objection	= ' '		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	the Examiner. Note the attack	1ed Office Action or form P1O-15	)2.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		2 2 4 4 2 4 3 4 13 4 12	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International * See the attached detailed Office action for 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for d since a specific reference was included in 37 CFR 1.78.	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in the priority documents have be Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). or a list of the certified copies in the omestic priority under 35 U.S.	n Application No en received in this National Stage not received. C. § 119(e) (to a provisional appl	lication)
a)   The translation of the foreign langua			
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for d reference was included in the first sentence.			
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		w Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)	
2)		of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2645

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiner et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0206116) and in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,553,094).

Regarding claim 1, Weiner discloses a housing (fig.5, element 80; page 7, paragraph 0071).

Weiner further discloses a display supported by the housing (fig.5, element 84; page 7, paragraph 0072).

Weiner further discloses a controller (i.e., microprocessor) coupled to the display (fig.7, element 100).

Weiner further discloses a memory coupled to the controller (i.e., microprocessor) (fig.7, element 102).

Weiner further discloses a radio frequency transceiver coupled to the microprocessor and configured to establish and maintain a wireless link with a communications network for sending and receiving data (fig.7, element 104; page 8, paragraph 0077).

Weiner further discloses a radio frequency transceiver coupled to the microprocessor and configured to establish and maintain a wireless link with a communications network for sending and receiving data (fig.7, element 104; page 8, paragraph 0077).

Art Unit: 2645

Weiner further discloses a program stored in the memory and configured to automatically establish the wireless link with the communications network at a time approximating a predetermined time (fig.7, element 104; page 9, paragraphs 0084, 0085, 0088).

Weiner fails to teach "the program configured to select at random a time within a predetermined interval to establish the wireless link, the predetermined interval being at least one of adjacent and around the predetermined time". Johnson teaches the program configured to select at random a time within a predetermined interval to establish the wireless link, the predetermined interval being at least one of adjacent and around the predetermined time (col.8, lines 19-22, col.14, lines 45-56). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Weiner to have the program configured to select at random a time within a predetermined interval to establish the wireless link, the predetermined interval being at least one of adjacent and around the predetermined time as taught by Johnson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to simplify network operations as well as to reduce costs.

3. Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiner et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0206116) and in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,553,094) and further in view of Astrom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,169,881).

Regarding claims 2-5, Weiner in view of Johnson fails to teach that the predetermined interval is either a 30 minute interval, a 10 minute interval, a 5 minute interval or a default time. Astrom teaches that the predetermined interval is any time (i.e., either a 30 minute interval, a 10 minute interval, a 5 minute interval or a default time) (col.12, lines 55-67, col.13, lines 1-7, 33-36). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 2645

was made to modify Weiner in view of Johnson to allow the predetermined interval being either a 30 minute interval, a 10 minute interval, a 5 minute interval or a default time as taught by Astrom. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to obtain a plurality of samples that sufficiently represent the location of satellites with respect to the location of the terminal.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Weiner in view of Johnson fails to teach that the default time is in the range of 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. Astrom teaches that the default time is any time (i.e., in the range of 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.) (col.12, lines 55-67, col.13, lines 1-7, 33-36). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Weiner in view of Johnson to allow the default time being in the range of 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m as taught by Astrom. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to obtain a clear status within the default time interval.

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiner et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0206116) and in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,553,094) and further in view of Owensby (U.S. Patent No. 6,647,257).

Regarding claim 8, Weiner in view of Johnson fails to teach that the program is configured to cause registration with a messaging service provider server when the wireless link is established. Owensby teaches that the program is configured to cause registration with a messaging service provider server when the wireless link is established (col.4, line 55-col.5, line 1-7). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Weiner in view of Johnson to allow the program is configured to cause registration with a messaging service provider server when the wireless link is established as

Art Unit: 2645

taught by Owensby. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to acquire and route communications initiated or received by the subscriber's personal wireless mobile phone.

5. Claims 9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,553,094) and in view of Weiner et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0206116).

Regarding claim 9, Johnson teaches selecting a predetermined time (col.8, lines 19-22, col.14, lines 45-56).

Johnson further teaches selecting an interval that is at least one of adjacent and around the predetermined time (col.8, lines 19-22, col.14, lines 45-56).

Johnson further teaches choosing at random a link time within the interval (col.8, lines 19-22, col.14, lines 45-56).

Johnson fails to teach "attempting to establish a wireless link with the communications network at the link time". Weiner teaches attempting to establish a wireless link with the communications network at the link time (page 9, paragraphs 0084, 0085, 0088). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Johnson to establish a wireless link with the communications network at the link time as taught by Weiner. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the local patient monitoring.

Regarding claim 11, Johnson fails to teach "the wireless link is used for providing an e-mail messaging service". Weiner teaches that the wireless link is used for providing an e-mail messaging service (page 5, paragraph 0060, page 6, paragraph 0063). Thus, it would have been

Art Unit: 2645

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Johnson to the wireless link is used for providing an e-mail messaging service as taught by Weiner. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to view the patient data using web browsers.

Regarding claim 12, Johnson teaches the wireless link is a radio frequency (RF) communications link (col.6, lines 64-67, col.7, lines 1-10).

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,553,094) and in view of Weiner et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0206116) and further in view of Owensby (U.S. Patent No. 6,647,257).

Regarding claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 8.

7. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,553,094) and in view of Weiner et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0206116) and further in view of Astrom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,169,881).

Regarding claim 13-16 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 2, 6, 5 and 7 simultaneously.

8. Claims 17 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiner et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0206116) and in view of Gollnick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,771).

Regarding claim 17, Weiner discloses a communications network (fig.2).

Weiner further discloses a portable electronic device including a transceiver configured to establish a wireless link to the communications network (fig.7, element 104; page 8, paragraph 0077).

Art Unit: 2645

Weiner fails to teach "the portable electronic device including a wake mode in which the wireless link is established and messages may be sent and received by the portable electronic device and a sleep mode in which the wireless link is not established and messages may not be sent and received by the portable electronic device, the portable electronic device including a program to randomly select a time to transition from the sleep mode to the wake mode during a predetermined time interval". Gollnick teaches that the portable electronic device including a wake mode in which the wireless link is established and messages may be sent and received by the portable electronic device and a sleep mode in which the wireless link is not established and messages may not be sent and received by the portable electronic device, the portable electronic device including a program to randomly select a time to transition from the sleep mode to the wake mode during a predetermined time interval (abstract; col.34, lines 31-45, col.37, lines 14-26, col.39, lines 40-53, col.41, lines 40-53). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Weiner to have the portable electronic device including a wake mode in which the wireless link is established and messages may be sent and received by the portable electronic device and a sleep mode in which the wireless link is not established and messages may not be sent and received by the portable electronic device, the portable electronic device including a program to randomly select a time to transition from the sleep mode to the wake mode during a predetermined time interval as taught by Gollnick. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to conserve power.

Regarding claim 25, Weiner discloses that the portable electronic device is a handheld computer (fig. 5).

Art Unit: 2645

9. Claims 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiner et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0206116) and in view of Gollnick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,771) and further in view of Astrom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,169,881).

Regarding claim 18-23 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 2-7 simultaneously.

10. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiner et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0206116) and in view of Gollnick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,771) and further in view of Owensby (U.S. Patent No. 6,647,257).

Regarding claim 24 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 8.

## Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alam Elahee whose telephone number is (703) 305-4822. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (703) 305-4895. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

Page 9

Application/Control Number: 09/903,132

Art Unit: 2645

M.E.

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE

December 27, 2003

Allan Hoosain Allan Hoosain for PRIMARY EXAMINER for Fan Tsang